



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,499	12/03/2001	Paul Trpkovski	44046.103.219	6472

7590

03/26/2003

Allen W. Groenke
Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.
900 Second Avenue South
1100 International Centre
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER

SLACK, NAOKO N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3635

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010,499

Applicant(s)

TRPKOVSKI, PAUL

Examiner

Naoko Slack

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/03/01 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 26, lines 11 – 12, the following description appears in error: "In figure 24, first mask 937 is shown overlaying masked portion 953 of the first face 927 of first pane 920." In Figure 24, there appears to be only one mask, indicated by two different numerals, 953 and 937. There does not appear to be one mask overlaying a masked portion. Furthermore, there is no reason in the specification explaining why one mask would be overlying another mask.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show a first mask overlying another mask as described in the specification (page 26, lines 11-12). Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "953" and "937" have both been used to designate the

Art Unit: 3635

masked portion on the first face. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 25 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US Patent 6,120,908 to Papanu et al. Papanu et al. teaches a method of strengthening glass window panes by treating the edges of the glass with an aqueous solution containing a epoxy and silane-based strengthening compound (column 2, lines 25-33 and column 4, lines 2-10) which may be applied by spraying (column 7, lines 9-10). While Papanu et al. does not detail the masking of glass faces prior to spraying the strengthening compound, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mask all areas other than the edges of the glass, as masking is commonly used to protect areas from an applied coating, and Papanu et al. states that only the edges and a small fraction of the faces should be coated with the compound (column 7, lines 31-32).

Claims 7-24, 26-29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US Patent 6120908 to Papanu et al. and US Patent 5439716 to Larsen. Papanu et al. claims a window wherein at least one pane is coated with the strengthening compound (column 18, claims 12 and 13). While Papanu et al. fails to specifically claim double and triple pane windows, Papanu et al. claims a window wherein at least one pane is coated with the strengthening compound (column 18, claims 12 and 13). The phrase "at least one pane" implies that the window could have more than one pane, such as found in double and triple pane windows.

Larsen shows a common double pane window with two glass panes (10 and 12) separated by a spacer (22) and seals (21 and 38) that could benefit from the edge strengthening process taught by Papanu et al. The edges of the window panes could be sprayed with strengthening compound, and as the spacer and seals physically mask portions of the second face of the first pane and the first face of the second pane, application of strengthening compound to the edge of the panes would be blocked in those areas. Papanu et al. recommends that strengthening compound should be applied to the glass edges and can overlap onto the faces such that the area covered be less than 10% of the flat surface area (column 7, lines 31-36).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naoko Slack whose telephone number is (703) 305-0315. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (6:00 am-2:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl D. Friedman can be reached on (703) 308-0839. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.



NS
March 15, 2003



Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600